



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

method. "Record" means now source and again secondary work; because the prevailing method insists that the best kind of a source is the record of an eye-witness, Dr. Bowman insists that it makes "contemporaneity" the chief test of trustworthiness and ignores all others; increase in the quantity of careful monographic work instead of being looked upon as a proof of scientific advance is held up as proof of decadence, of inability to produce a larger synthesis; these larger syntheses could be written, if we would only "trust the record", eliminate foot-notes, that often occupy more space than the text, and accept the results of the work of the careful investigator as authoritative. The treatment of Thucydides, at the close of the pamphlet, is an astonishing example of what this kind of medieval confidence in a writer will lead to. Dr. Bowman quotes Macaulay, Jowett, Freeman, Rhodes, and *all the English encyclopedias* (!) to prove that Thucydides was "the embodiment of all the virtues of his calling and of all political wisdom and prescience as well. . . . Thucydides", he tells us, "has no foot-notes. The books of his day being on rolls and not paged did not admit of them. Neither has he sustained himself occasionally by mentioning in the narrative itself some of the sources of his statements. And yet Thucydides is accounted not only a good, but the best and greatest historian."

All that is sound in Dr. Bowman's monograph touching the evaluation of a source has already been stated by Bernheim, and in greater detail; all that is new smacks of the credulity of the Middle Ages to which it is not at all probable that historical science will revert.

FRED MORROW FLING.

Homer and History. By WALTER LEAF, Litt.D., Hon.D.Litt. [The N. W. Harris Lectures, 1914-1915. Northwestern University.] (London: The Macmillan Company. 1915. Pp. xvi, 375.)

To say of any book that it is a worthy successor to Mr. Leaf's *Troy: a Study in Homeric Geography* is to accord it very high praise (*cf. Am. Hist. Rev.*, XVIII. 563) both as a work of literature and as a piece of scholarly investigation. That statement the reviewer can make gladly and unhesitatingly with regard to *Homer and History*, although his attitude to the two books is quite different.

The value of the former work lay in the convincing establishment of its main thesis—the reality of the Trojan War. That idea came practically as a novelty—it had been so long and vigorously rejected—and it is destined, in the reviewer's opinion, to become the corner-stone of Homeric studies. Nothing of the sort is contained in the present attempt to erect a superstructure upon that foundation. Its merit lies on the contrary in a wealth of detail, often brilliant and convincing, always stimulating and suggestive; but which in the opinion of the reviewer needs rectification at many points.

The opening chapter, Gods and Men, is a discussion of *Sagenver-*

schiebung and kindred ideas, leading up to the conclusion that it is nothing unreasonable to "take the ostensibly historic background of the Homeric poems to represent fact, clothed in poets' forms, but still remaining fact". Chapter II. pictures according to archaeological evidence and Egyptian records "The Coming of the Achaians". The exclusion of the evidence from Greek dialectology seems to have brought its own punishment, but the chapter contains a fascinating comparison of the Achaians with the Normans in Sicily, and a convincing and much needed refutation of the proposition: "All changes of race involve changes of culture perceptible to the archaeologist." The four following chapters, Boeotia, the Dominion of Peleus, the Dominion of Odysseus, the Realm of Agamemnon, confront the picture of Achaian Greece gathered from the rest of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* with that offered by the Catalogue of the Ships to show that while the former is "consistent alike with itself, with geography and Greek tradition", the latter is in direct contradiction with all three. This dissonance is real and has long been felt, but the argument for it has never been presented so clearly and completely as Mr. Leaf has given it. Of especial value are the description of the geographical conditions at Aulis, the presentation of Dörpfeld's Leukas-Ithaka hypothesis in a way that ought to carry conviction, the identification of Taphos with Corfu, and the discussion of the meanings of Argos. In regard to the last it should be noted that Argos=Peloponnese is later than Argos=Greece. That reflects the first step in the dismemberment of Agamemnon's realm. The seventh chapter deals with the rise of Hellenism from the "Fusion of Races"—the Achaian conquerors and the subject "Pelasgian" population. The final chapter gives Mr. Leaf's theory of the rise of "The Achaian Epos". The Homeric poems represent the literary tradition of the Achaian courts undisturbed by the vagaries of popular fancy; they are genuine history, though poetically embroidered. This belief the reviewer cannot share. If the *Iliad* were history, the *Odyssey* could not, as it does, put a taboo upon every incident mentioned in the other poem, and still remain historical itself. The mere fact that the *Odyssey* mentions neither Hector nor Paris is extremely significant. Equally so perhaps is a discrepancy between the poems which is so far from being obvious that it has escaped even Mr. Leaf. In the *Iliad* the base of the expedition against Troy is Lemnos; in the *Odyssey* the rôle played by that island is purely mythological, its place in the story of the war being apparently taken by Lesbos.

Legend—a nucleus of fact and an accretion of fancy—must still, the reviewer believes, be regarded as the foundation of the poems. Mr. Leaf's service is that he has shown that this nucleus is real, and that it is much larger than would have been expected. It is a service for which we should be very grateful.

G. M. BOLLING.